

## REMARKS

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, the examiner stating that there is no support in the specification for that limitation "...the interface is a radio frequency communications interface for communicating with the electronic device". The fact that such original claim language forms part of the original filed disclosure, however, clearly reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In any event, to advance prosecution, claim 7 has been amended to more explicitly correspond to the original description at page 4, lines 21-30. Of course, as a radio frequency communications device is a well known example of a wireless transceiver, its use is still included in the scope of amended claim 7.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a), the Examiner stating that the feature "...the interface is a radio frequency communications interface for communicating with the electronic device" must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim. As explained above, claim 7 has been amended consistent with the original description at page 4, lines 21-30. Note that wireless communications transceiver 52 is illustrated in Fig. 5. Accordingly, no drawing corrections are believed to be necessary.

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (US 2002/0193141 A1) over Boehme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,670) in view of Kotchick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,642,977).

In reference to claims 1 and 2, the examiner states that Wu discloses a bracket for a personal digital assistant in Fig. 2-4 comprises bracket 21 (corresponding to the frame), display device 28 (display screen) a connector 25 and interface 24 (corresponding to the electrical mechanism interface), a memory 27 and a charge battery 210 (corresponding to the power supply and memory). While acknowledging that Wu does not disclose an electrical/mechanical interface on the frame for releasably attaching the frame to any one of a plurality of different electronic devices, the Examiner further states that Boehme discloses a display for a portable computer provided with a standardized set of electrical and physical element for the electrical interfaces and connectors of different

electronic device (col. 5, lines 10-25), and that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the connector and interface in the frame of Wu with a standardized set of electrical and physical element taught by Boehme for the benefits cite in Col. 1, lines 45-col. 2, line 20 of Boehme. Additionally, the Examiner states that Kotchick discloses in Fig. 8 an electronic device having a removable display module (e.g., removable display modules can be used to replace a monochromatic LCD module with a full color LCD module, to replace an LCD module with another display type such as an organic electroluminescent display), and that it would have been further obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Kotchick's teaching (i.e., replace OLED display for the system, in the device of Wu and Boehme, to replace smaller display modules with larger display modules, to replace low resolution display modules with higher resolution display modules, to replace display modules that no longer function with working display modules, and the like). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The basic combination of Wu with Boehme and Kotchick proposed by the Examiner would not have been prima facie obvious to the artisan. While the teachings of Boehme and Kotchick are directed towards detachable or replaceable displays for portable electronic devices, Wu is specifically directed towards providing a specialized bracket for use with a PDA device which converts the PDA device into a functional digital camera. Wu only teaches to design the bracket 21 thereof to specifically match the PDA, not to design a PDA usable with a variety of electronic devices. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in the prior art to modify the PDA of Wu to make it compatible with functioning as a detachable display for a variety of different portable electronic devices. While the cited advantages of Boehme and Kotchick might provide motivation to modify the PDA 2 of Wu to provide a detachable display device 28 of the PDA 2 itself (i.e., to allow replacement of the display device 28 in the PDA itself), there would be no motivation to modify Wu to include the interchangeability features of Boehme as to the connection between the PDA 2 and the bracket 21 of Wu as proposed by the Examiner. Reconsideration of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested with respect to claims 1 and 2. The additional dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, Boehme and Kotchick and further in view of Etoh (U.S. Patent No. 5,792,289). This rejection is respectfully traversed. In addition to the basic deficiencies with respect to the primary rejection based upon Wu and Boehme in view of Kotchick, the further reliance upon Etoh with respect to claim 12 is flawed as there would be no motivation to provide controls on the bracket 21 of Wu which are subsequently covered when the PDA 2 is attached, as the bracket 21 of Wu has no functionality on its own. It is only functional as a camera when employed in combination with the PDA 2 (i.e., as described in paragraph 18, camera functionality requires use of CPU 22 and memory 27 of PDA 2). Thus, having controls on the bracket 21 covered by the PDA would be useless. Reconsideration of this further rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, Boehme, Kotchick and further in view of Malloy Desormeaux (U.S. Patent No. 6577821). This rejection is respectfully traversed. While Malloy Desormeaux includes a reference to radio frequency operation of a camera, the basic deficiencies with respect to the primary rejection based upon Wu and Boehme in view of Kotchick discussed above are clearly not overcome by such further teachings of Malloy Desormeaux. Reconsideration of this further rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (585) 722-9662  
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148